The Office Action dated March 12, 2010, has been received and carefully noted. The above amendments to the claims, and the following remarks, are submitted as a full and complete response thereto.

Claims 25-68 are currently pending in the application, of which claims 25, 42, 46, and 49-52 are independent claims. Claims 25, 27, 42, 46, 49-54, 57, 61-63, and 66-67 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. No new matter has been added. Claims 25-68 are respectfully submitted for consideration.

Claims 25, 28-40, 42-44, 46-47, 49-52, and 55-67 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by "Control Mechanisms for High Speed Networks" of Cidon *et al.* ("Cidon") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,466,060 of Riddle ("Riddle"). The Office Action acknowledged that Cidon fails to disclose the generation of update information and "wherein the respective updating information sent to the immediate offspring nodes differs from each of the immediate offspring nodes based on the spanning tree structure" and similar features. The Office Action cited Riddle to remedy the deficiencies of Cidon. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art.

Cidon describes a high speed packet switching system for integrated voice, video and data communications, known as PARIS. The packet handling functions of PARIS are implemented mainly in dedicated high speed hardware, with only control functions requiring software involvement. The packet handling functions are based on variable

- 16 -   Application No.: 10/512,061

sized packets combined with Automatic Network Routing (ANR), a form of source routing where each packet contains an ANR header composed of a concatenation of several link identifiers. The ith identifier in the ANR header defines the outgoing link label of the ith hop along the packet path. As the packet progress through the network, the used identifiers are stripped off, so that the first bits in the ANR field always contain the routing information for the current node. (See Cidon at page 301.1.1., Introduction).

As noted above, the Office Action acknowledged that Cidon fails to explicitly state the generation of updating information and wherein the respective updating information sent to the immediate offspring nodes differ for each of the immediate offspring nodes based on the spanning tree structure. Now, the Office Action has referred to a newly cited reference, Riddle, and pointed out that Riddle allegedly teaches the generation of updating information and wherein the respective updating information sent to the immediate offspring nodes differs for each of the immediate offspring nodes based on the spanning tree structure, relying on column 3, lines 33-56, of Riddle.

However, there is at least one important difference between the combination of Cidon and Riddle and the presently pending claims. Namely, according to Riddle, column 5, line 54, to column 6, line 17, each node seems to generate a new routing information which takes the form of an exclusionary tree **with the transmitting node as a route of the tree**. Additionally, it is important to notice that the exclusionary tree is a description of **some portion** of the entire network according to the present information of the transmitting node, **but excluding any links connected to the node to whom the**

Application No.: 10/512,061

routing information is being transmitted. Consequently, the spanning tree of the combination of Cidon and Riddle does not include routing paths corresponding to shortest paths from the network node to **all** other nodes.

Furthermore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not view such a feature as necessary in the combination of Cidon and Riddle, as Riddle proposes a different approach, where each transmitting node generates **its own spanning tree** and forwards it to neighbor nodes.

In the presently pending independent claims, the spanning tree of routing paths corresponds to shortest paths from the network node to **all** other nodes. Specifically, claim 25 recites, in part, "determining, based on topology information of a radio access network, a spanning tree of routing paths corresponding to shortest paths from the network node to all other nodes," and claim 42 recites, in part, "distribute a network parameter information to network nodes of a transmission network in accordance with a spanning tree of routing paths corresponding to shortest paths from said apparatus to all other network nodes." The other independent claims, each of which has its own scope, each recites at least some similar features. As these features contradict the teaching of Riddle, the subject matter of the new independent claims cannot be anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited prior art. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of independent claims 25, 42, 46, and 49-52 be withdrawn.

Claims 28-40, 43-44, 47, and 55-67 depend respectively from, and further limit, claims 25, 42, and 46. Thus, each of claims 28-40, 43-44, 47, and 55-67 recites subject

Application No.: 10/512,061

matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 28-40, 43-44, 47, and 55-67 be withdrawn.

Claims 26-27, 41, 45, 48, 53-54, and 68 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being anticipated by Cidon in view of Riddle and further in view of WO 00/70782 of Neumiller *et al.* ("Neumiller"). The Office Action acknowledged that the combination of Cidon and Riddle fails to disclose or suggest certain further limitations of the claims. The Office Action cited Neumiller exclusively with respect to such further limitations. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims recite subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the combination of Cidon, Riddle, and Neumiller.

Claims 26-27, 41, 45, 48, 53-54, and 68 depend respectively from, and further limit, claims 25, 42, and 46. At least some of the deficiencies of the combination of Cidon and Riddle with respect to claims 25, 42, and 46 have already above. Also, as noted above, Neumiller was introduced merely with regard to the use of the claimed network parameter information in the field of network operation and management procedures in a radio access network.

Thus, it is unsurprising that Neumiller does not remedy the above-identified deficiencies of the combination of Cidon and Riddle. Accordingly, the combination of Cidon, Riddle, and Neumiller fails to disclose or suggest all of the elements of claims 26-27, 41, 45, 48, 53-54, and 68 and it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 26-27, 41, 45, 48, 53-54, and 68 be withdrawn.

Application No.: 10/512,061

For the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that each of claims 25-68 recites subject matter that is neither disclosed nor suggested in the cited art. It is, therefore, respectfully requested that all of claims 25-68 be allowed, and that this application be passed to issuance.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, Applicants' undersigned representative at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,

/Peter Flanagan/

_____
Peter Flanagan
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 58,178

Customer No. 32294
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP
14TH Floor
8000 Towers Crescent Drive
Vienna, Virginia 22182-6212
Telephone: 703-720-7800
Fax: 703-720-7802

PCF:dlh